

they are both in effect, that the local governments instead of the General Assembly will then have jurisdiction over any intra-county authorities, such as a metropolitan district of something of that nature that exists solely inside the boundaries of the county? Would the county would then have jurisdiction over the organization and regulation of that authority rather than the General Assembly?

Take the Howard or Harford County metropolitan district as an example.

DELEGATE MOSER: It really would depend again on the schedule or the interim provisions.

Presumably, the structure of who does what as between the General Assembly and counties would be preserved. It would continue the way it is now. If the General Assembly handles that now, it probably would continue to do under the interim provision.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Under the interim provisions, once 7.05 and 7.06 are both fully operative would any such district established by public local law then be subject to the jurisdiction of the county government and not to the jurisdiction of the General Assembly?

DELEGATE MOSER: I really cannot answer the question without having a couple of specific laws in front of me.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be clearer to Delegate Moser if you do not refer to previously existing authorities.

I take it your question is directed to authorities hereafter created.

DELEGATE HANSON: No, my question is directed to existing authorities which were created by local legislation.

DELEGATE MOSER: I have answered it. It depends on what happens with respect to interim provisions. With respect to creating new authorities of course, the power lies with the county unless the legislature acts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Unless the legislature would preempt the power of counties to act?

DELEGATE MOSER: Yes.

DELEGATE HANSON: Under section 8.06, may the counties acting jointly do everything that the State can do under section 7.10 except to establish a popu-

larly elected regional government? In other words, can they create an intergovernmental authority or other inter-county agency of some sort?

DELEGATE MOSER: Yes, I think they could.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rybczynski.

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: Mr. Chairman, looking at section 7.03 and this section which you previously explained as meaning that one charter would be adopted by the General Assembly for many possible counties, am I correct in saying that even though a county might be actively trying to get a charter together or instrument of government together, if it were not accepted by the county people voting that the statewide charter would then become operative on July 1, 1972?

DELEGATE MOSER: If it were not adopted by that time, yes.

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: Under 7.04, let us say that the charter that the people are trying to get together and get approved by their county people is a lot different, maybe totally different, from the standard form. Would the wording of section 7.04, that is, an amendment to the instrument allow the county to adopt a totally new charter, not just an amendment to the State's form charter?

DELEGATE MOSER: They could amend by adopting a totally new charter. The intention is to make this as broad as possible, but obviously some of the provisions would be the same. They would have to be. The amendment is intended to be given broad meaning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Clagett.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Mr. Chairman, would not the right of amendment provided by section 7.04 make it unnecessary to provide an optional mandatory instrument on the July 1, 1972 date? In other words, the charter which becomes effective by reason of the county not having enacted one prior to that date could be amended to conform to whatever that county wanted?

DELEGATE MOSER: That is true.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: With respect to the question that was asked by Delegate Case in connection with section 7.08, where he pointed out that a civil unit might be granted taxing power by the county whereas an intergovernmental authority